



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/072,517

02/06/2002

Lawrence J. Fronczak

01-1508

2883

25537 7590 05/01/2009

VERIZON  
PATENT MANAGEMENT GROUP  
1320 North Court House Road  
9th Floor  
ARLINGTON, VA 22201-2909

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, QUYNH H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2614

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/01/2009

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@verizon.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/072,517	<b>Applicant(s)</b> FRONCZAK, LAWRENCE J.	
	<b>Examiner</b> QUYNH H. NGUYEN	<b>Art Unit</b> 2614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on petition and remarks filed 3/28/08.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 7-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 7, 8 and 12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 9-11 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as not falling within one of the four statutory categories of invention. Supreme Court precedent (*Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); *Cochrane v. Deener*, 94 U.S. 780, 787-788 (1876)), and recent Federal Circuit decisions (*In re Bilski*, 88 USPQ2d 1385 (Fed. Cir. 2008)) indicate that a statutory “process” under 35 U.S.C. 101 must (1) be tied to another statutory category (such as a particular apparatus), or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or material) to a different state or thing. While the instant claim recites a series of steps or acts to be performed, the claim neither transforms underlying subject matter nor is positively tied to another statutory category that accomplishes the claimed method steps, and therefore does not qualify as a statutory process. For example, the steps of receiving, selecting, and incorporating are not tied to any apparatus.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2614

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7-8 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uchida (US Patent 5,787,075) in view of Miloslavsky (US Patent 5,905,792).

As to claim 7, Uchida teaches the steps of: receiving automatic route selection service information corresponding to a service subscriber (abstract; Fig. 1, *subscriber terminal 1, subscriber circuit 2, automatic routing selection 3*); implementing the automatic route selection service for the service subscriber using a switched based automatic route selection table (col. 5, lines 50-64; col. 6, lines 42-56).

Uchida does not teach implementing the automatic route selection service for the service subscriber using a non-switch based automatic route selection table and incorporating automatic route selection information used to implement the selected automatic route selection method into call processing record accessible by a service control point.

Miloslavsky teaches implementing route selection for the service subscriber using a non-switch based automatic route selection table (col. 6, lines 24-27; col. 11, lines 14-24; col. 13, lines 49-53) using a service control point (*SCP 101*) from plurality of different routing methods (col. 2, lines 14-16 - *routing done at SCP and further routing accomplished at call centers or PBX/switch*). Miloslavsky does not explicitly implement the selected automatic route selection method into call processing record. However, Miloslavsky teaches processor system routes incoming calls based on pre-stored

Art Unit: 2614

information of telephone stations and forwards the data packet over digital communication link (col. 3, lines 58-62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Miloslavsky into the teachings of Uchida for the purpose of having a more efficient system by routing calls being done on several levels, for example, pre-routing at SCP and further routing being accomplished at call center.

As to claim 8, Miloslavsky teaches the non-switch based automatic route selection table implements in a service control point (col. 6, lines 24-27; col. 11, lines 14-24; col. 13, lines 49-53).

Claim 12 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 7. Furthermore, Uchida teaches a telephone switch coupled to a telephony device used by the subscriber (Fig. 1); Miloslavsky teaches a service control point (SCP 101) coupled to the telephone switch.

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

3. Claims 9-11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As to claims 9 and 11, prior arts of record fail to teach, or render obvious, alone or in combination a method of providing an automatic route selection service using service control point comprising the claimed means and their components, relationships, and functionalities as specifically recited in claims 9

Art Unit: 2614

and 11 and independent claim 7 that they depend on. Claim 10 is objected because it depends on objected claim 9.

### ***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 7-12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quynh H. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-7489. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 6:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad Matar, can be reached on 571-272-7488. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Quynh H Nguyen/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2614